

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action contends that the previously provisionally-elected "Species 1," i.e., Figures 1a to 1c, 2a to 2e, and 3a to 3e, include the following alleged subspecies:

Alleged Subspecies A	-	Figures 2a to 2d
Alleged Subspecies B	-	Figure 3c
Alleged Subspecies C	-	Figure 3d
Alleged Subspecies D	-	Figures 2e and 3e

Applicants provisionally elect Alleged Subspecies A, i.e., Figures 2a to 2d, with traverse. Claims 19 to 28, 30 to 32, 38 to 41, 43, and 44 correspond to the provisionally elected Alleged Subspecies A. Claims 19 to 28, 30 to 32, 38 to 41, 43, and 44 are generic to multiple Alleged Subspecies.

Applicants respectfully traverse the alleged lack of unity of invention with respect to the alleged subspecies for at least the following reasons. In order to make a proper determination as to whether the unity of invention requirement is satisfied in connection with the alleged subspecies, the prior art must be taken into consideration. The Office Action does not include any indication whatsoever that any prior art was taken into consideration in identifying the alleged subspecies. Thus, it is believed and respectfully submitted that the Office Action has not properly established that unity of invention is lacking.

Furthermore, it is not clear why Alleged Subspecies D is considered to lack unity of invention with respect to Alleged Subspecies A. In this regard, Figure 2e of Alleged Subspecies D is a side view of the output gear illustrated in Figures 2a to 2d.

Withdrawal -- or at least modification -- of the alleged lack of unity of invention is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 29, 2008

By: /Clifford A. Ulrich/  
Clifford A. Ulrich  
Reg. No. 42,194

KENYON & KENYON LLP  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212) 425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**